DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 123 UD 010 841

AUTHOR Strack, C. M.; Dahlstedt, W. A.
TITLE Desegregation, the Learning Process, and Changing Values in Human Relations. Institute Interim Report.
INSTITUTION Henderson State Teachers Coll., Arkadelphia, Ark.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [66]
CONTRACT OEC-4-6-000107-1946
NOTE 61p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; Cultural Differences; Curriculum Planning; Educational Quality; Effective Teaching; Equal Education; Human Relations; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Intergroup Relations; Language Skills; Learning; *Race Relations; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS Arkansas

ABSTRACT

The Institute was conducted from June 6, 1966 through July 8, 1966 by Henderson State Teachers College, which accepted forty-five participants in teams of three from each of fifteen school districts. The team consisted of a supervisor, a guidance person, and a language arts specialist or classroom teacher. Those participants nominated were considered potential leaders in the task to enhance effective education and desegregation. The Institute's objectives were as follows: (1) increase insight and understanding of multi-cultural contrasts and conditions present in desegregated classrooms; (2) increase ability to deal with language skills within the classroom; (3) become aware of own and other's attitudes, which condition and restrict teaching success; (4) reach a greater level of skill in formulating and applying corrective programs in the classroom; (5) examine evaluation procedures as related to a multi-cultural class; and, (6) assess possible gains from applying ideas of methodology, such as ungraded schools, team teaching, and more complete audio-visual procedures. (Author)

ED056123

INSTITUTE

INTERIM REPORT

DESEGREGATION, THE LEARNING PROCESS, AND CHANGING VALUES IN HUMAN RELATIONS

CONTRACT NO. OEC 4-6-000 167-1946

PUBLIC LAW 88-352, TITLE IV, SECTION 404, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, 1964

C. M. Strack
Program Director

W. A. Dahlstedt
Assistant Director

Henderson State Teachers College
Contractor

A project reported under support by contract by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD010841

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	STAFF-	1
I.	PURPOSE	3
II.	PARTICIPANTS	5
III.	METHODS AND MEETINGS	13
IV.	PROGRAM AND CONTENT	14
V.	METHODS	26
VI.	TEACHING AIDS	27
VII.	CONSULTATION AND GUIDANCE	28
VIII.	INFORMAL PROGRAM	28
IX.	FACILITIES	28
X.	SCHOOL SYSTEM PARTICIPATION	28
XI.	FOLLOW-UP PLANS	29
XII.	GENERAL EVALUATION AND PROCEDURES	29

APPENDICES

A.	Letter to Participants and Application Form	32
B.	Daily Schedule	34
C.	Keynote Address	38
D.	Self-Evaluations	45
E.	Institute Evaluations	57

STAFF

The staff of the institute consisted of members of the faculty of Henderson State Teachers College, and special lecturers, consultants, and resource personnel.

Director - C. Miller Strack, Dean of the General College, Henderson State Teachers College

Assistant Director - Waldo A. Dahlstedt, Professor of Education, Henderson State Teachers College

Instructors:

Carl W. Kreisler - Chairman of Division of Secondary Education, Western Kentucky State University, Bowling Green, Kentucky

Floyd W. Parsons - Superintendent of Schools, Little Rock, Arkansas

Hillquit Lynch - Professor of Sociology, Henderson State Teachers College

Conella C. Brown - Assistant Director of the Human Relations Division, Cleveland Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio (Negro)

Roberta L. Whitfield - Instructor, Little Rock Public Schools (Negro)

Marion Fowler - Instructor, Little Rock Public Schools (Negro)

Byrla Jean - Instructor, Arkadelphia City Schools

John Fortenberry - Assistant Superintendent for Research, Little Rock Public Schools

Mattie Crossley - Supervisor, Secondary Education, Memphis City Schools, Memphis, Tennessee (Negro)

Lee Reaves - Director, Arkansas Educational T.V., Little Rock, Arkansas

Heloise Griffon - Supervisor, State Audio Visual Services, Little Rock, Arkansas

Thomas J. Edwards - Senior Language Arts Consultant, Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois (Negro)

M. Blair Hart - Chairman, Department of Speech, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas

Dorothy Rice - Professor of Education and Psychology, Delta State College, Cleveland, Mississippi

Virginia R. Keehan - Director of Programs, Job Corps, Washington, D. C.

Phyllis V. Coker - Regional Curriculum Project, Director and Coordinator for Tennessee State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee

STAFF

Ruth Guthrie - Associate Professor of Education, Henderson State Teachers College

Elsie Ross - Associate Professor of Education, Henderson State Teachers College

An Interim Institute Report

Desegregation, the Learning Process,
and Changing Values in Human Relations

I. Purpose

In August of 1965, Henderson State Teachers College was called upon to host a one-day institute meeting of superintendents interested in and concerned with possible aid for their developing plans for desegregation. This meeting was followed by a more complete presentation in February of 1966. In this later instance, a two-day institute was conducted to which administrators were invited to consider some specific kinds of programs and concepts which were believed significant to effective school integration.

As a part of this sequence of meetings a third institute was organized and presented under the title of "Desegregation, the Learning Process, and Changing Values in Human Relations." The main program was carried on between June 6 and July 8, 1966. The five-week study is to be concluded by a one-day follow-up meeting on December 3, 1966.

The purpose of the above sequence of meetings was to present to the public schools of this area the possibilities of developing in-service and special educational programs which would assist their teachers and their staff in becoming more effective in their purpose of education while carrying out a desegregation program. In planning for the summer institute, some 150 school districts were contacted as to the kind of need they had identified during the year. An examination of these statements led to the summer institute program and objectives, aimed to enhance the capabilities of public school faculty in the following:

1. To increase their insight and understanding of the multi-cultural contrasts and conditions present in a desegregated classroom.

2. To increase their ability in practice to deal with language skills within the classroom.

3. To become aware of their own and others' attitudes, frequently unbased and stereotyped, which condition and restrict teaching success.

4. To reach a greater level of skill in formulating and applying corrective programs in the classroom.

5. To examine evaluation procedures as related to a multi-cultural class.

6. To assess possible gains from applying ideas of methodology, such as ungraded schools, team teaching, and more complete audio-visual procedures.

The foregoing objectives were re-addressed to participants in the following manner.

Although we cannot expect dramatic changes in people as a consequence of working in a five-week institute, we do need to be clear about what we are trying to accomplish or we will be unable to select appropriate acttivities or to evaluate our work. Those of us who have been involved in planning the institute believe that some change toward the objectives listed below is feasible.

As people work and study in the institute, they should show progress toward the development of:

1. Wholesome attitudes toward human variability by: being willing to deal with problems of intergroup and intercultural differences, finding satisfaction in working on common problems with people who are different, participating effectively in the amelioration of conflict situations, examining their own sets of attitudes and values.

2. Knowledge and understanding of cultural and biological variability in man, including facts about race and ethnic groups, the interrelation-

ships between cultures and personalities, common human needs, social class differences, and stereotyping and the categorization of human needs.

3. Familiarization with the educational consequences of economic and "cultural" deprivation and discrimination.

4. Familiarization with programs and activities designed to overcome the effects of deprivation, and to intervene between the circumstances of deprivation and their social and educational consequences.

5. Personal action plans to improve educational opportunities for boys and girls, including ways of working with children so that they may become better able to assess and accept themselves, and better able to participate in wholesome enterprises, ways of working with teachers so that they may become increasingly sensitive to the needs of others, and consequently, improve their own self images, ways of working with school and community leaders so that they may become increasingly interested in school improvement.

6. In collaboration with other school district and community leaders, a plan for school year 1966-67 to work on one or more specific educational problems which have been occasioned as a result of school desegregation, including the definition of specific problems, analyses of the circumstances surrounding these problems, steps to be undertaken to resolve these problems, and resources available and needed and their use.

II. Participants

The College invited school systems in south Arkansas to nominate school team participants for the institute. Each team from a school was to consist of an administrator, a person engaged in guidance counseling, and a person teaching the language arts. The school team represented, by the responsibility of its members in the school system, the major areas

of concern for the institute. Letters and forms sent to the superintendents were the basis for individual nominations and the formulation of a school team. (See Appendix A) As the nominations were received, they were reviewed for completeness and a conference was held with the Assistant Director and the Dean of Instruction of the College in order to judge approval. As a matter of actual practice, very few teams were eliminated because approval and announcements of the institute were possible only two weeks before the institute was held. It was determined that the need to have a relatively complete total number outweighed the possible restriction we may have had in mind as to particular participants. Generally, the persons nominated and attending met the school team categories. The list which follows shows the participating school teams and their public school assignments. As the beginning date for the institute neared and the total number applying was considerably below the hoped-for number, it was decided to allow a few individuals at the administrative level to participate by themselves in the institute. In a few cases, the individual team contained no person with primary administrative responsibilities. In each of these cases it was requested that the superintendent give the College assurance of his support on the developments reached as a result of the institute before these people were approved for institute participation.

Participants by School District

School District*	Team Personnel	Public School Assignment
Ashdown	Everett Taylor(N)	Principal
Bearden	Leonard J. Simpson	Principal
	Larry J. Anthony	Counselor-Teacher
	Al Cash	Social Science Teacher-Coach
Benton	G. S. Williams (N)	Principal
Blevins	Kermit Jamisson	Principal
	Joan Coggins	Third Grade Teacher
	Clarence Harris	English Teacher-Counseling
Delight	Charles Cox	Counselor and Supervisor
	Lady Mae Cox	Twelfth Grade Teacher-Library
	Patsy Stockton	First Grade Teacher
DeQueen	Lee Roy Piggee (N)	Principal
Dierks	Shirley E. Dowdy	Supervisor-Business Education
	Dorothy B. Rooks	1st Grade Teacher-Elem.Supvr.
	Mildred R. Staggs	Second Grade Teacher
Glen Rose	George S. Fite	Superintendent
Gurdon	Gaines Thompson	Elementary Principal
	Mary Ann Newton	English Teacher
	Hugh White	Guidance and Counseling
	Delores Hodge (N)	Remedial - English
Horatio	Norma R. Smith	English and Library
	Donald R. Cain	Athletic Director and Coach
	Bobbie Jane Cook	Remedial Reading
Little Rock	Willis M. Crosby	Principal
	Pearl C. Warren (N)	Counselor
	Cecil Webb	Special Education
Mountain Pine	Darwin Foshee	Counselor
	Kenneth Hardister	Social Science Teacher
	Ada M. Mitchell	Social Studies,4th,5th,6th Gr.
Okolona	William R. Jones (N)	English Teacher
	James Crofton (N)	Science,History and Coach
	Fadie Gentry (N)	Commercial Teacher
	Ida Boyd (N)	Home Economics Teacher
Ouachita	Billy R. Pye	Principal
	Marshall Cook	Counselor
	Maxine Phelps	English Teacher
Sparkman	Elby Gaston	Teacher and Librarian
	Corrine Taylor	History and Social Studies
Spring Hill	Charles McConnell	Coach and Study Program
	Jeanette McConnell	Fourth Grade and Phys. Educ.
Washington	Vada O. White(N)	Language Arts & Social Studies
	Argusta L. Trotter (N)	Principal
	Gladys Golston (N)	Home Economics

*All in Arkansas

There were 12 Negro participants present. The school assignments show 1 superintendent, 10 principals and supervisors, 11 counselors, and 21 with teaching assignments.

Most of the schools represented are relatively small and come from rural communities. A small town situation exists in the case of DeQueen and Gurdon, Benton is a community of small city size, and Little Rock is a metropolitan area.

The condition of desegregation varied from minor, because of a small population of Negroes in the area, to large, in the case where Negroes make up the predominant group in a given school district. This range of conditions was thought to be important for the participant group, however, it could not be claimed that it was designed.

The main problem confronted by the College in finding appropriate personnel to participate in the institute was the length of time in which it had to be done. It is understood that this time period was attributable to no particular single condition, but because it occurred,the College acted with emphasis upon workability rather than a rigid following of the initial team concept. It was felt, however, that the institute group essentially conformed to teams of principals, counselors, and language arts teachers as was initially conceived.

Permanent college staff used were the following members of the Henderson State Teachers College faculty: Dr. C. M. Strack, Dr. W. A. Dahlstedt, Dr. Hillquit Lynch, Miss Ruth Guthrie and Mrs. Elsie Ross. The director, Dr. Strack, had,as his primary function, the general administration of the institute, which included such activities as oversight on the facilities used, coordinating and arranging for presentations by individual instructors, and conferring with the individual participants. The director, on the whole, was prepared for the management of activities that were demanded by the institute. The general policy in administrative oversight was to allow a participant voice in practices related to their needs and the group present had some hesitancy in accepting the role. A tighter structuring may have been helpful.

Dr. Waldo A. Dahlstedt, Assistant Director, Professor of Education, had the function of oversight and coordination of the substantive content of the

institute presentations and participant consultations. It appears from this experience that a half-time assignment was insufficient. Lecture presentations on social attitudes and seminar supervision by Dr. Dahlstedt were very well received and admirably prepared. He could function well in similar institutes. The evaluations made of the general administration of both the director and the assistant director were favorable.

Miss Ruth Guthrie presented a series of short discussions, lectures on the availability materials and possible uses of these materials for reading instruction. This is in the area of Miss Guthrie's speciality, elementary education, and was admirably presented. Miss Guthrie is working in similar institutes and should be encouraged to continue.

Mrs. Elsie Ross presented a brief orientation on the reading laboratory for the institute and then coordinated and assisted institute members in their practicum participation and observation in the reading laboratory. This was a strong program which may well have been increased in length for the participants working in the language arts area. Mrs. Ross can be effectively used on other occasions where reading skills are involved.

Consultants, guest lecturers, and visiting instructors: The personnel who were on the staff and who were invited in for the purpose of working with the institute are commented on in the order of their appearance.

Mr. Floyd Parsons, Superintendent of Schools, Little Rock, Arkansas, was asked to present a keynote lecture which was done in a superior manner. It would be desirable that Mr. Parsons participate in this manner in other institutes as he has already done.

Dr. Carl Kreisler, Western Kentucky State University, was the lead instructor during the first week when the emphasis was on the background of the multicultural society and the general developments in desegregation activities over the southern United States. Dr. Kreisler was the one staff person present who

was best received by the group. His preparation was excellent although it lacked formal structure. Dr. Kreisler has done similar work frequently and, if he is interested, should be encouraged to participate in further institutes.

Mrs. Conella Brown (Negro), Human Relations Division, Cleveland Public Schools, was a visiting lecturer for one day and presented the experience in which she had participated regarding desegregation and inter-cultural groups in the Cleveland area. Her preparation was excellent. She made a concise, to-the-point discussion, and was most effective in leading the institute to clearer awareness of the ramifications of inter-cultural interests and desegregation upon the public school.

Three persons were present in the institute in the role of resource consultants. They were asked to act in this fashion in order that there be present individuals with special background to work with the school teams in the formulation of their school plans. These resource persons were: Marian Fowler (Negro), Little Rock Public Schools, Roberta Whitfield (Negro), Little Rock Public Schools, and Byrla Jean, Arkadelphia Public Schools. Mrs. Fowler and Miss Whitfield were classroom teachers who had been participants in a desegregation institute during the summer of 1965 and had taught in the Little Rock Public Schools in an integrated staff-student situation with marked success. Mrs. Jean had assisted and participated in an institute of this nature previously and had special interest in the area of reading. These resource people carried on a variety of activities ranging from assisting committees in informal get-together plans to addressing the institute in a formal manner as members of the instructional staff. Their assignments were varied so it was not possible that they come prepared for the total assignment but each made a significant contribution to the institute effectiveness, particularly in assisting seminar school teams and inter-personal relations among participants.

Mr. John Fortenberry, Assistant Superintendent, Little Rock Public Schools, reviewed, in an address to the group, the concepts of team teaching and ungraded primary schools as methodological basis for expanded reorganization of the educational effort. His preparation was admirable. He presented the Little Rock experience with which he has had first-hand contact and should be a very desirable contributor to any institute in this area.

Mrs. Mattie Crossley (Negro), Secondary Education Supervisor, Memphis City Schools, made a major presentation in the period of time devoted primarily to educational methodology. She came well prepared and, on a broad spectrum of experience, presented her understandings and experience with the Memphis development of ungraded primary schools and team teaching activities in desegregated school situations. Mrs. Crossley's presentation indicated that she had come well prepared and also evidenced her strong concern with the general desegregation interests of the Negro. Her further participation in other institutes would be encouraged.

Two persons from the state education staff in Little Rock were used as special lecturers. These were Mr. Lee Reaves, Director of Arkansas Educational T.V.and Miss Heloise Griffon, State Audio-Visual Services Supervisor. Both of these people made a competent presentation of their particular functions and services potentially or actually rendered by the agency with which they were working. Neither of the individuals presented material that was primarily related to desegregation. Both work with agencies that provide possible desirable school aid. Their presentations were good, though not outstanding, and there is no strong reason to suggest that they participate in further institutes of this nature.

Dr. Thomas Edwards (Negro), Science Research Associates, Chicago, made an outstanding contribution on the relationships among general concepts of language arts, evaluation, desegregation, and classroom situations. His work

with the group was most stimulating and it is certainly most desirable that he participate in further such activities. He is particularly well prepared to work with this kind of an institute with emphasis in language arts or in the sociological complex.

Dr. Blair Hart, University of Arkansas, Department of Speech, was asked to present two lecture discussions emphasizing oral communications factors. He effectively revealed problems of meaning and understanding by involving the class in basic speech experiments. The time allotted to this presentation could have been cut one-half and the presentation would still have been effective. Dr. Hart is recommended for further activity if his skills fit the program.

Dr. Dorothy Rice conducted the week of presentation focused on guidance. She effectively reached the guidance emphasis upon the individual and was successful in getting expression of the personal points of view held by the participants. This was a strong period of instruction and was effective in opening the group to a fuller exchange of ideas and attitudes. Dr. Rice can be of great aid to a similar institute program.

Dr. Virginia Keehan, Job Corps, Washington, D. C., reviewed the Job Corps experience with students of questionable backgrounds for study and made a clear statement of the potentials often present once begun. Her presentation was helpful to the group and she is recommended as a special lecturer.

Dr. Phyllis Coker, Director, Tennessee Regional Curriculum Project, was the major instructor in the period focused on reading. Her treatment included a wide range of emphases and was well adjusted to the needs expressed by the participants. Dr. Coker made a lively and well-received presentation and is recommended for other institutes if her area of competence is pertinent.

III. Methods and Meetings.

The general program and mechanics for the institute envisioned in its initial formulation - that nearly all of the participants would be living on campus - was not possible to achieve this proportion and approximately half lived on the campus.

In presenting instructions, a flexible combination of lectures, formal and informal, seminars, work groups and the total institute were employed. When smaller groups were involved, several separated classrooms were used. When the total institute was together, they were in one room which was used throughout the period of the institute. In this room a series of bibliographic references were assembled so that the class, whenever such was needed, could consult the materials. These materials were freely used by the institute participants as needed.

The daily meeting sessions met regularly, 9:00 A.M. until 12:00 noon, and again in the afternoon from 1:00 P.M. until 3:00 or 4:00 P.M. The length of the afternoon sessions varied because of the desire to have a flexible afternoon period so that certain presentations could be completed rather than be carried on to a following day. The combination of seminar and large lecture grouping was not allowed to fall in any particular pattern but was fitted to the needs of the particular instruction being given or the particular lecturer present at a given time. In addition there was a day to day check of participant reaction, so when a particular program mechanics was found to be inappropriate, we made adjustments.

During the second week and the fourth week a time was devoted to discussing evaluation and follow-up. The participants were asked initially to be aware of the plan and to begin to think toward it. The last period, devoted to follow-up planning, combined various participant suggestions, comments and plans evolved in the seminars into a tentative concept, to be completed and then executed as a follow-up on the date of December 3, 1966.

IV. Program and Content

A day to day program by weeks is shown in Appendix B. In the following we wish to review the weekly emphases and comment on the general context and content presented.

The first week beginning on June 6, was devoted initially to a short period of organization in which the final matters for registration were completed. After this period a lecture-discussion explained the major requirements of the five-week period and introduced the idea of the "school desegregation education plan." Seminars surveyed bibliography selections and chose items for initial use. This day of activity was followed by the formal beginning with Mr. Floyd Parsons, Superintendent of Schools in Little Rock, presenting the keynote speech. (See Appendix C) Briefly Mr. Parsons presented ideas concerning the new role of public schools in leading the development of American culture, the condition under which possibly unfortunate federal control may develop, the need for school administrators to reassess the entire public educational structure, the demands present for new organizational patterns, the significance of an insertion of artificiality in public school activities, and the development of a new point of view or kind of prejudice developing out of civil rights emphases, the problem of Negro staff integration when the special market they have had is disappearing, and finally the encouragement provided by new legislation to engage in educational activities not previously thought possible.

Dr. Carl Kreisler, Western Kentucky State University, was the primary instructor for the period when the background of the multi-cultural society and its sociological and psychological conditions were explored. These conditions were woven into a pattern which allowed participants to discuss on frequent occasions in small groups and to raise questions of their understanding of the developments in the South. Dr. Kreisler presented the following concepts. He placed emphasis upon the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its clear

cut requirements. In so doing he attempted to make clear that the compliance made by various sections of the South often were an attempt to minimize compliance and therefore there was a possibility that individuals who had agreed to plans approved by the Office of Education would find themselves in difficulty because they had not met the stated plan. The socio-economic class differences were explored with emphasis upon the changing nature of this situation. In addition, the self concept as formulated by various class groups within the society was examined in order to make clear that individuals frequently reflect the nature of their group and the position of that group in the larger society. It was pointed out that the Negro in the American society and especially in the South has need to identify with something positive and that both the Negro and white have been stereotyped in the minds of each so that frequently it is impossible for an individual to clearly see the other group because the stereotyped concept often dominates thinking. The main understandings of the social structure focused around the following ideas: there is an intense and rapid change of social values and social organization now going on; man is increasingly dependent upon others and, therefore, all groups in the society have a significant and meaningful role to play; there is a greater possibility of change of role today than there has been in the recent past; it is necessary for any group's conscious contribution that they be able to condition themselves to possible successes rather than being conditioned to inevitable failure; society is built on general and mutual understanding to both agree and disagree but above all to accept; the school situation in this society must be structured so that students can experience success; and lastly, people, in the South particularly, cannot afford to become cynical and unwilling to accept the possibility of change.

In a special lecture on social values in the South, Dr. Hillquit Lynch summarized the week's work with the following points: studies of this region

indicate that its sectionalism is decreasing; the industrialization of agriculture has reduced the need for farm workers and changed the crop balance so that a fundamental base on which previous Negro-white relationships existed is no longer present; urbanization of the South is moving the Negro out of rural areas into urban sections which also changes the bases for and the nature of Negro-white relationships; the changes in social structure have led to changes in social values so that there is a decrease of despair, a gain in employment, an increase in Negro voting, greater recognition of Negro purchasing power,plus a significant increase in education. The value system of the American Negro is a parallel modification of dominant American values, however, the modifications made by Negro society are significant and have produced important variations. These variations include a balance between the value of family life and opportunity for employment leading to a "value stretch" making non-legal marriage an acceptable condition for some Negroes. Structural pluralism in the Negro society made it more difficult for their social value system to fit into the American pattern. For this reason the integration movement has its elimination as one aim.

Stereotyped notions of the Negro value system are often incorrect and surveys made indicate that most of the time the Negro is concerned about the same things as is his white contemporary. Negro and white social value contrasts tend to be somewhat in reverse of each other; for example, the white sees a ban on intermarriage as of major significance whereas most surveys indicate that the Negro sees this as a relatively minor factor; the Negro, on the other hand, sees inequality in justice, politics, and economic opportunity as a major factor whereas in many instances white value systems indicate these are minor factors in segregation.

Increasingly favored, integration, both in the nation and in the

South, emphasizes the significance of education which is clearly correlated with increased acceptance of integration.

Mrs. Conella E. Brown, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, Cleveland Public Schools, related experiences in Cleveland to the conditions of desegregation and the complex of cultural and ethnic groups in that area. Key concepts from Mrs. Brown's presentation were as follows: human relations issues are among the most acute problems facing our nation and the world today; in emphasizing improved human relations we make a strong attempt to reduce and ultimately eliminate those prejudices and discriminatory practices which affect the education of children in our schools; when we consider human relations, we are talking about relations among people, their ability to understand and harmoniously interact with others; human relations problems common to our schools include poor communications and absence of interaction between faculty and administration, the presence of teacher cliques which create conflicts and disharmony, failures of the principal to win acceptance by parent groups and neighborhood organizations, student body groups of particular ethnic background who resent non-local influence in their schools, children reflecting parental prejudices against racial and ethnic groups in the community, teacher rejections of lower class children and lack of professionalism in the staff. Much can be done to the improvement of human relations by careful educational activities, some of the main requirements are these: stressing contributions from various cultures and national groups; encouraging pupils to dramatize stories which will help them see and feel what it means to be of one ethnic group compared to another; using projects which require team effort to accomplish goals; planning continued exchange programs to permit intergroup sharing of experiences. No matter what one may think to the contrary, a biased teacher will be seen as such by the child. Much of the Negro pupil's low level of aspiration comes from living

in a society which has taught that he is inferior and that he cannot and must not hope for and expect to become a full and equal member of the white man's social, economic, and political life. As educators, we are challenged to help in every possible way to raise aspirational levels. It is significant that the quality of self image produced depends in great measure upon the quality and quantity of interaction relationships made available to the individual through school programs. The school's effectiveness in attacking the learning needs of a minority and culturally deprived group involves continued careful planning, clear cut objectives, recognition of what is to be taught and a careful selection of chosen means. Mrs. Brown presented a bibliography of materials used in the Cleveland area and a human relations inventory used in their work. (See Appendix D)

The second week's activity moved into consideration of how the school might organize and develop its own program in order to meet desegregation conditions. The methodology involved here was presented primarily by Mrs. Mattie Crossley, Secondary Supervisor, Memphis City Schools, Memphis, Tennessee. Mr. John Fortenberry, Assistant Superintendent of Little Rock Public Schools, who has been conducting a series of methodological studies in the Little Rock system, presented the opening concept and in essence described the success he had in Little Rock in developing team teaching and ungraded primary schools. Mrs. Crossley explored the methodology that might be developed considering the backgrounds of students in learning and the impact of possible groupings, the experience of the Memphis schools as they moved through the first months of an integrated situation and their further experience in developing new means to meet the flux of education demands was incorporated into the presentation. It was emphasized that it is of great significance to provide a child, particularly a child from a disadvantaged situation, the experience for raising their aspirations and a basis for expecting success. It would appear to be that it is around the flexible

treatment of a particular group of students that the greatest gain for the ungraded class can be made. Among the possibilities a few things stand out: less frustration for the teachers in trying to interest every child at the same level; encouragement for the teacher to see each student individually and in developing particular talents; the avoidance of the label "dumb" for the child. It is in respect to the potential for individual emphasis and the encouragement of each different individual, because of his value to our society, that the ungraded school offers special significance when desegregation is also a growing concern of a particular school system.

The opportunities in developing a flexible schedule and using team teaching so that the maximum effective use of time is obtained for both teacher and student are significant. Concept centered education offers a better chance for these gains: a greater encouragement for students to learn on their own, a teacher can become a learning assistant rather than an authority; more student opportunity to read intelligently for a variety of purposes; the library is more effectively tied into academic activities; a focus upon subject principles and their manipulation in new combinations encourages self responsibility for learning; students have an increased awareness of change in the social situation in classes, in student population, and a realization that these are normal conditions; and students learn to deal with a variety of points of view in a variety of large and small groups with a greater possibility for free inquiry.

The changing nature of our society and increased incorporation of a many-valued multi-cultural society into one school system creates a special need on the part of a desegregated school for new methods and approaches in order to truly improve the educational situation. A special demand is made for adjusting habitual patterns of teaching to a different group of students whose emphasis and motivation for learning is different. Careful organization and provision for special learning aids and space needs will be

involved to form an effective school program methodologically in tune with desegregation.

Early in the second week the "Inventory of Beliefs" was administered to members of the institute. This instrument,published by the American Council on Education, is an assessment of the rigidity of the individual. High scores indicate a relative readiness to change or an absence of stereotyped kinds of thinking. Low scores indicate a lack of flexibility and a tendency to prefer stereotyped, relatively rigid situations. The scores made by the group (Appendix D) indicated that they were relatively flexible, only six members fell in the below 50 score category, which on the basis of test experience, would indicate a more rigid point of view. Median scores indicate that the women participants were somewhat more flexible than were the men. Inventory norm data refers to college sophomores and freshmen. Nevertheless, it seemed desirable to make the assessment with the idea in mind to encourage an open, relatively flexible, frame of mind on the part of the individual.

During the final day of the second week the opinionnaire scales (Appendix D) were distributed to the group. They were patterned after previous institutes. Participants were asked to discuss their reactions among themselves and in their seminar groups. The basis for such action was an attempt to have the participants more aware of their own points of view.

In order to tie reading, learning, and remedial practices to the institute activities, a practicum of three weeks was organized in cooperation with the reading laboratory. Participants were divided into four groups, who rotated in attending the reading lab for the first hour and a half of each day. Each person was able to be in the laboratory working with and observing young people in their reading activities for three to five hours during the institute.

During the third week of the institute emphasis was placed on the language arts and the primary instructional leader was Dr. Thomas J. Edwards, Science Research Associates. In addition, members of the education staff of the College, Professors Elsie Ross and Ruth Guthrie, participated. A special lecture series was presented by Dr. Blair Hart, University of Arkansas.

Dr. Edwards built his presentation around case studies which formed a basis for the development of significant concepts for use during instruction in the language arts especially when a desegregated and probably culturally deprived class exists. Dr. Edwards, who preferred to work with the entire group, was able to engage all of the members in discussion during instruction. Basic concepts illustrated included the following: in testing, care should be made that people are not stigmatized into a particular category; in working with language development a careful series of questions can provide a successful base to stimulate thinking; an instructor must carefully evidence concern and compassion for the student and his needs; interesting experiences can be used as vehicles for learning; diagnosis can be practiced while general instruction is taking place and at the same time adequate models for goals of the individual can be provided; as the needs of the individuals in a class become apparent it is possible to make intelligent modifications of the curriculum so that student needs can be adequately met; standard English can be taught as a means of expression and of obtaining acceptance without destroying, for the student, his colloquial vocabulary; by using the provocative question, class discussion can be encouraged while stimulating logical thinking and indicating the usefulness of ideas held by the students and demonstrating the logic and mechanics of outlining to evolve a pattern of thinking and knowledge; the language experience program is highly transferrable to other content areas; it is possible to successfully combine a program of remediation with a prescribed curriculum; careful and compassionate relationships developing with the class can do much to dispel a Negro's fear

and lack of self image; all of the language arts - communications skills, listening, speaking, reading, and writing - must be involved and developed as the particular difficulties and deficiencies become apparent. Throughout this presentation Dr. Edwards worked both with a method which he was illustrating and with the idea of specific concepts and specific learnings which evolve through intelligent careful application of work in the language arts. An article, "The Language-Experience Attack on Cultural Deprivation," The Reading Teacher, April, 1965, by Thomas J. Edwards, was provided as a statement of the basic concept and documentation.

Mrs. Ross, to assist organization of the reading laboratory work of the institute, presented the experience encountered at the college level with students who needed remedial aid in reading. Miss Guthrie reviewed a variety of materials available currently for the development of a reading and language arts program in the elementary grades. During her presentation a display of available materials was present and the institute had opportunity to examine a variety of approaches.

Dr. Blair Hart presented a lecture-discussion in which he examined problems involved in speech. Difficulties of clear oral communications were brought out through a series of experimental examples with the institute members as examples. This discussion evolved a deeper understanding, on the part of the institute, of the problems of oral communication and also made them aware of speech as an academic area of study.

The role of guidance in the desegregated school system was the primary emphasis during the fourth week of the institute. During this time the main instructional emphasis was made by Dr. Dorothy Rice, Delta State College, Cleveland, Mississippi. Dr. Rice examined the basic concepts involved in the counseling and guidance point of view and extended these concepts into the classroom situation. The major theme came to be an exploration of individual

values, understandings, and beliefs among the participants and as they would possibly operate in the classroom.

The following general factors were central to the discussions and lectures. It was brought out that a guidance program must involve the whole school in order to use the resources, to have staff participate in guidance planning and contribute to guidance and counseling activities. The essential point of view expressed belief and respect for the worth of every individual plus recognition and concern for individual differences.

Guidance learnings include the need on the part of every child to: mature in self-understanding and acceptance of responsibility for self-understanding; to grow up in his view of the world of education and work and the choices involved; to reach maturity in making choices and solving his own problems; to grow in a sense of moral values, inner conscience and sensitivity to others; to mature in understanding human relations, personal and social adjustment. To aid students in reaching such learnings, it is essential to obtain: full acceptance of each learner; complete freedom of expression; a system of learning experiences leading to progressive levels; persistent focus upon self-evaluation; continuing emphasis on study of relations with others; varied new experiences pushing the child toward new aspects of living including the controversial; continual parent involvement in the school guidance program. In its role of personalyzing education and mediating between student and mass programs, guidance focuses on optimum development, responsibility to society, cooperation, wise choices, student understanding and on helping the person to actualize his best self.

The participants explored the personal barriers present among Negro and white. Dr. Rice successfully elicited group expression of their fears and conflicts as a means whereby a deeper awareness of student need could be attained. Class participation included an open discussion of current

Negro "movements" as they may develop and influence integration. The pressures present among the participants were expressed, at least in part. A fuller sensitivity to the inter-group, personal attitudes was obtained and less submergence of real reaction was present.

Dr. Virginia Keehan, Program Director for Job Corps, Washington, D. C., lectured during the latter part of the week. She explored the general Job Corps impact and indicated some of the potentials for development learned from Job Corps experiences. In essence these understandings are: just putting some studies together is insufficient, a tailored program is essential; deprived youth do not assess themselves as such; Job Corps students are in a "no hope" social group where perpetual welfare often exists; planning a future and school routine are strange and foreign to these students; self-understanding and self-commitment and pronounced progress have been possible; really doing an educational task may well require more staff, tutorial aid, longer days and the tapping of unused community resources. While Job Corps experience has been unique and unusual there has been success and a way to broader application has become apparent.

The final week began with a return to the language arts with a special interest in reading. Dr. Phyllis Coker, Nashville, Tennessee, Regional Coordinator, presented the main emphasis during the week. The reading laboratory program continued through the week. Ways and means whereby the disadvantaged child can be moved along the way into greater success and greater achievement in reading were examined. The final part of the fifth week was devoted to summarizing and sharing the school plans prepared. During this time each school team submitted, to the staff, their written school plan from which the key concept was presented orally to the institute for discussion. Each school team was then interviewed by the director and the assistant director so that there could be a detailed discussion of

problems felt by the school team to exist in their particular area.

Dr. Coker's lectures and accompanying services considered those phases of reading skills which had been asked for by the participants. The range of requests allowed the instructor to reach into most aspects involved in remedial reading and in learning to read. From the study made, the following significant concepts are noted: the teacher, not materials, is the key to effective reading learning; motivational efforts should include acceptance by teacher of child; knowledge of and adjustment to home environment; wide variety of activities and means for participation; developmental reading involves skills in vocabulary and language structure as well as skills in the comprehension of facts, organization, evaluation, and interpretation; broadened ability in comprehension and vocabulary grow out of continuing varied and related experiences tied to the child's beginning level and expanding into new areas. The presence of culturally disadvantaged students increases the need for care to include real adjustment to individual needs.

As presented, the reading study made an excellent summary of previous work in the institute. The factors which were significant to the general culture, the field of language arts,and to guidance came to bear upon an on-going reading program which in turn was reinforced by experience in the reading laboratory.

The program content above was the essence of the formal part of the institute. A significant aspect of institute activities, however, was the inclusion of informal along with the more formalized academic program. Staff plans hoped to encourage a participant-generated series of informal group activities. This did occur and on several occasions the institute members were invited to the homes of nearby participants. The participants also organized and attended informal recreational get-togethers in the evening and in the late afternoon, and finally set up a dinner meeting at which a program was developed wherein all members were engaged in some manner. It

is judged on the part of the staff that the informal associations came to be more and more accepted and used by the participants in the institute. The informal activity plan is felt to have been successful and to have made significant contributions as participants experienced a desegregated student and staff situation in the institute.

As each area of study was concluded, the seminar groups compiled a summary and digest of their discussions and concerns during the particular period. These summaries have been reflected in the discussion of content.

V. Methods

The central feature of the methods employed was the preparation of a school education-desegregation plan. Each district team had this as an initial assignment and was asked to work to this end throughout the institute. Consequently the lecture-discussion and seminar meetings were received against a background of the separate local situations and the evolving plan for the school district.

All staff members were made aware of the school plan requirement and were sensitive to participant needs as expressed to them in general seminar or individual discussions.

The most effective instructional methods used were reflections of the individual instructor. Dr. Kreisler, by combining lecture comments with seminar visits, reached all participants effectively. His impact on the group was not, however, a matter of method in the usual sense. Dr. Rice pre-arranged a controversial discussion on points of view held by Negro and white. The result was most effective in reaching behind the facade of tacit acceptance to make the importance of these attitudes apparent in guidance. Some, however, were most irritated by this procedure.

The institute program was built around lectures-discussions-seminars. Effectiveness was generated through open and receptive conduct of these

meetings with schedule adjustment being made in response to staff or participant requests.

VI. Teaching Aids

Readings required:

Frost, Joe L. and Hawkes, Glenn R., The Disadvantaged Child, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966

Torrence, E. Paul and Strom, Robert D., Mental Health and Achievement, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1965

It was planned to provide materials for reading laboratory work but this became unnecessary because enough was present in the laboratory. Previous and descriptive data disclosed no film material recommended by the staff and this was felt to be a possible weakness in staff judgement or in availability of truly appropriate items. Mrs. Crossley supplemented her discussion on methodology by using a film strip,"Focus on the Individual - a Leadership Responsibility," (NASSP). Both Mr. Fortenberry and Mrs. Crossley provided copies of materials used in putting new methodology into practice. These were most useful.

Suggested readings and bibliographies were listed for the participants. The provision of a library of publications in the institute room was very helpful. Major book company displays were available on campus and were sometimes useful.

The publication planned for use, Learning Together, was lost in shipping and has not been available. Its selections should have been of aid.

VII. Consultation and Guidance

All staff persons were available for consultation. Their use varied with participant demand. The resource persons were conferred with often and daily. The director or assistant director (sometimes both) conferred with each school team on at least two, often more, occasions. Conferences on the school plan were held mid-way in the institute and at the close.

The major gain through these exchanges was to clear up communications. How the ideas for school programs might be worked out and applied was also aided through conferences. Visiting staff were tapped most frequently during seminars and informal discussions at meals and breaks. It is believed that most of the school plans, with three probable exceptions, would have reached an essentially embryotic formulation were the chances to confer with the staff unavailable.

VIII. Informal Program

As noted earlier the informal program was generated out of participant interest and demand with staff encouragement. This was a deliberate procedure and was successful. By request and through participant action, individually and in committee,informal coffee breaks gradually became a total group affair. Evening get-togethers were held in near-by homes. An institute party was held in the dormitory and voluntary attendance got two-thirds present. The final evening banquet had a program involving all participants and presenting selections and parodies of the institute program.

These experiences were vital in making a new insight into racial integration potentials apparent to the participants.

IX. Facilities

The provision of a single room in which the group met and where library references were available was a helpful facility. Other than this there were no special arrangements. Seminar rooms, dormitory,and cafeteria and student union facilities are all more than adequate and were so evaluated by the institute.

X. School System Participation

As was sketched in the introductory portion of this report, the institute evolved from experience with school administrators attending two previous short institutes. Schools present had also been represented in

the earlier meetings. Contacts made in working with proposals for programs in Cleveland, Hempstead, and Howard Counties gave insight into needs. There were, however, no school systems separately selected to work with program planning. It should be noted that the Little Rock Public Schools administration cooperated admirably in encouraging staff personnel to lend a hand when requested

During the institute all participants had, and most used, opportunity to plan and suggest program adjustments. It is expected that these school teams will be present in follow-up meetings and the schools represented will in this manner benefit from the follow-up program.

XI. Follow-Up Plans

The concept for follow-up actions visualizes a program whereby each school team will receive and complete a report of their plan status during November, 1966. At the same time they will be asked to re-assess the institute experience.

These materials will be assembled and summarized for review at a one-day follow-up meeting planned for December 3, 1966. At this time, the school teams will report on and discuss the degree to which they have progressed on the plans made during the institute. It is presumed that these are expected to be reviewed and explained. Since most plans included proposals for expanded Negro-white involvement of students, faculty, and public, a review of their success is expected to be useful and revealing.

Participants, as they worked out ideas on follow-ups, requested that Dr. Carl Kreisler be present in a consultant role. It is intended to make these arrangements if possible.

XII. General Evaluation and Procedures

Two evaluation questionnaires were completed by all participants (see Appendix E) during the last days of the institute. Staff personnel shared

an institute assessment discussion. During the institute, adjustments were made as participants evaluated and commented on procedures.

In the main, the participants assessed the program as very satisfactory with particular reactions ranging from poor to excellent. There was a marked increase by nearly all in sensitivity to contrasts in Negro-white interests and view points. All persons were at some point personally involved in the inter-changes among participants. At the same time there was a feeling expressed that more and deeper assessments of desegregation problems were desired. This was interpreted to mean that the institute was not able to set forth all the answers to increasing integration. In some cases there was an expressed attitude of inability to do anything because of local conditions which were seen as being outside the area of influence. Although the group had reservations, they stated and evidenced increased acceptance of the other race and were especially open to possibilities suggested by concepts of ungraded primary schools and team teaching. Furthermore, they became clearly aware of the need for inter-staff exchanges in planning and cooperative programs between Negro and white personnel. Self-assessment instruments are shown in Appendix D.

Participant ratings were on a six point, poor to excellent, scale. The following averages were listed: aid for faculty desegregation, 5; increased race acceptance, 4; helpfulness of the staff, 4.5; the available facilities, 4.5; exploration of desegregation concerns, 4.5; informal activities, 4; recommendation to try and repeat an improved institute, 4.5.

Strong points most mentioned were improved race relationships, work with special consultants and instructors, and aid from the resource group. Weak points noted most were a need for more personal interchange with visiting staff, detailed guides for the school plans, and a request to identify more desegregation problems.

The participants reported they had experienced an institute where interest was generally high, the program scope was excellent and useful, especially in guidance, methodology, and social factors. Facilities were satisfactory, the staff excellent, and instructional readings and aids were pertinent. They liked and appreciated the staff effort to tie the institute to local conditions. Follow-up reassessment will stress identification of gaps and new problems.

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
ARKADELPHIA, ARKANSAS 71923

APPENDIX A

May 16, 1966

Dear Sir:

Henderson State Teachers College, in cooperation with the Equal Educational Opportunities Program, will conduct an institute concerned with desegregation, the learning process, and changing values in human relations. The dates are June 6, 1966 through July 8, 1966.

The college is authorized to accept forty-five participants who are to come from fifteen school districts, three from each district. The district group is considered a school team and should consist of a principal, or someone in a similar supervisory position, a person with responsibilities in guidance and counseling, and a person instructing in the language arts,possibly a classroom teacher. Those nominated are to be staff members who will give leadership in the school task to enhance effective education and desegregation. You are invited to nominate participants for the institute. A letter from the superintendent making the nominations and accompanied by the enclosed application-registration forms will be adequate. Please ask if you have any questions about whether a possible participant meets qualifications. The participants accepted will be enrolled for the institute beginning on June 6, 1966, and will be paid a stipend of $75.00 per week, plus one round trip travel for the participants from the school district.

There will be no registration fees required. Campus dormitory residence is expected and will be paid by those enrolled. Participants will have the opportunity to work on their own school programs and to exchange views with outstanding educators. Contributors include: Dr. Dorothy Rice, Delta State College; Dr. Henry Passow, Teachers College, Columbia; Dr. Blair Hart, the University of Arkansas; and Dr. Thomas Edwards, Science Research Associates. Special emphasis will be placed on learning theory, guidance needs, methodology concepts and the language arts.

Enrollment may be for graduate or undergraduate credit or non-credit. Those persons wanting graduate credit will need to apply for entrance to the graduate program.

The institute can be an avenue for school and individual growth and an important contribution to your faculty. We invite you to nominate participants, both white and Negro, and if you have questions to address them to me.

Sincerely,

31

C. M. Strack
Dean of the General College

CMS:ct
Enc. - 3 Institute Reg. Forms
3 College Admission Forms

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Advance Registration and Application for the Special Institute: The Learning Process, Human Relations, and Desegregation, June 6 - July 8, 1966.

.....

NAME_____ DATE_____

HOME
ADDRESS:_____

SCHOOL
DISTRICT:_____

HIGHEST
DEGREE:_____ DATE_____ COLLEGE_____

PUBLIC SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT:

_____

_____

Briefly indicate the desegregated status of your school and how this has or will relate to your assignment.

_____

_____

INTENDED CREDIT STATUS:

1. Non-credit_____ 2. Undergraduate_____ 3. Graduate_____

(Note: Participants planning to receive academic credit for the institute must be properly admitted to the college graduate or under-graduate program. Please begin this process at once, it may be completed after arrival.)

APPENDIX B

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
Program Plan
Desegregation Institute
June 6 - July 8, 1966

FIRST WEEK - June 6 - 10, 1966

STAFF - Floyd Parsons, Carl Kreisler, Hillquit Lynch, Waldo Dahlstedt, Conella Brown, C.M. Strack, Marion Fowler, Byrla Jean, Roberta Whitfield

June 6
8 - 10 A.M. - Final registration
10 - 12 noon - Organization of seminar groups and orientation to total program plan.
1 - 4 P.M. - Preparation of school program outlines, planning for small group programs, and orientation to resource group leaders.

June 7
9 - 12 noon - Floyd Parsons, Superintendent of Schools, Little Rock, keynote speech and discussion of seminars on basic presentation
1 - 2 P.M. - General nature of the southern multi-cultural society - speaker, Carl Kreisler
2 - 3 P.M. - The impact of southern culture upon the personality - speaker, Carl Kreisler
3 - 4 P.M. - Seminar discussions - explorations in application

June 8
9 - 10 A.M. - The role in society of the Negro - speaker, Carl Kreisler
10 - 11 A.M. - Seminars - local examples corresponding to general concepts
11 - 12 noon - The personality of the individual roles - speaker, Carl Kreisler
1 - 2 P.M. - The social values system - contrasts in the south - speaker, Hillquit Lynch
2 - 3 P.M. - Small group exploration of material as seen in school systems operation
3 - 4 P.M. - Individual value contrasts in the south - speaker, Waldo Dahlstedt

June 9
9 - 11 A.M. - Special lecture, "Desegregation and the Nature of Learning," followed by discussion and extended remarks, Conella Brown, Cleveland Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio
11-12 noon - Seminars - Applying learning concepts
1 - 3 P.M. - Panel presentation with discussion - contribution areas, Negro and white - Staff

June 10
9 - 11 A.M. - Summary lecture - "The Institute and Status of Desegregation Today" - Carl Kreisler
10 - 12 noon - Seminars, formulation of reports
1 - 3 P.M. - Review and critique - Staff

SECOND WEEK - June 13 - 17, 1966

STAFF - John Fortenberry, Mattie Crossley, Lee Reaves, Heloise Griffon, Marion Fowler, Roberta Whitfield, Byrla Jean, C.M. Strack, Waldo Dahlstedt

June 13
9 - 12 noon - Seminar groups - A Formulation of Existing Methodology Practices and Problems
1 - 3 P.M. - Special lecture (discussion and extended remarks) Potentials in New Methods - John Fortenberry, Little Rock Public Schools
3 - 4 P.M. - Seminars - Adopting new methods, Initial adjustments

June 14
9 - 11 A.M. - Assumptions and assessments of learning readiness - speaker, Mattie Crossley, Supervisor, Memphis City Public Schools
11 - 12 noon - Possible groupings of students - seminar.
1 - 4 P.M. - Graded or ungraded class groups (lecture and seminar) - speaker, mattie Crossley

June 15
9 - 12 noon - The concept and need in team teaching (lecture and seminar) - speaker, Mattie Crossley
1 - 4 P.M. - How ungraded classes and team teaching go together (lecture and seminar) - speaker, Mattie Crossley

June 16
9 - 11 A.M. - Desegregation needs and new methods - Staff and panel
11 - 12 noon - Seminar, assessing audio-visual aids desired
1 - 3 P.M. - Educational T.V. in Arkansas (lecture and discussion) - speaker, Lee Reaves, Director, Arkansas Educational T.V.

June 17
9 - 12 noon - New media potentials and materials to aid special needs (lecture and discussion) - speaker, Heloise Griffon, Supervisor, State Audio-Visual Service
1 - 3 P.M. - Seminars, review, summary and exchange between groups. Preparation for reading laboratory, practicum and observation.

THIRD WEEK June 20 - 24, 1966 (Focus on the Language Arts)

STAFF - Thomas Edwards, Blair Hart, Elsie Ross, Marion Fowler, Byrla Jean, Ruth Guthrie, C. M. Strack, Waldo Dahlstedt

June 20
9 - 10 A.M. - Needs evident in college freshmen, speaker, Elsie Ross.
10 - 12 noon - Basic problems on language arts, the "why" of the situation as experienced in the school system - seminar groups and staff
1 - 4 P.M. - Lecture and discussion - "The Reality of the Problem in Teaching Language Arts," Thomas Edwards, Science Reaearch Associates, Chicago

37

June 21
9 - 12 noon - Identifying and working upon the needs present in
1 - 4 P.M. Language Arts - Thomas Edwards (Reading Lab group)

June 22
9 - 12 noon - Summary comments in the Language Arts area - Thomas Edwards
1 - 4 P.M. - Factors in speech, oral communications weaknesses, Blair Hart, Department of Speech, University of Arkansas

June 23
9 - 12 noon - Continuation of speech implications in education and desegregation (lecture and discussion) - Blair Hart. Reading lab observation by one seminar
1 - 3 P.M. - Planning language arts program, based on data presented - seminars

June 24
9 - 12 noon - Review and evaluation, guidelines in the school team plan, the local program developments. (Reading lab observation)
1 - 3 P.M. - Materials and techniques in language arts and reading concepts, related to integration - speaker, Ruth Guthrie

FOURTH WEEK June 27 - July 1, 1966 (Focus on Emphasis in Guidance)

STAFF - Dorothy Rice, Virginia Keehan, Marion Fowler, Byrla Jean, Elsie Ross (Reading Lab), C. M. Strack, Waldo Dahlstedt

June 27
9 - 12 noon - Trends and concepts - lecture, discussion - Dorothy Rice, Delta State College, Cleveland, Mississippi
1 - 2 P.M. - Small group - Status and need for guidance programs in Public Schools -
2 - 3 P.M. - Total group - Status and general concepts, exchanges of ideas

June 28
9 - 12 noon - Techniques in the classroom - lecture discussion - "New Meanings in Testing," Dorothy Rice
1 - 3 P.M. - Seminars - Aspects of applying techniques - Resource Group

June 29
9 - 11 A.M. - "Bases for and Problems in Guidance, Common Conditions," Lecture - Dorothy Rice
11 - 12 noon - Classroom applications - seminars
1 - 4 P.M. - Individual and group concepts as bases for guidance and counseling - guidance concepts and program guides, seminar Questions with lecture summary - Dorothy Rice

June 30
9 - 12 noon - Job Corps experience applied to desegregated schools,"The Role of Guidance," Virginia Keehan, Job Corps, Washington, D.C.
1 - 4 P.M. - Team programs in the local schools for guidance. Beginning formation of follow-up plan and evaluation.

GB

July 1

9 - 12 noon - Seminar programs - Team planning - Discussion of means to effectiveness and plans statement.

1 - 4 P.M. - Review and evaluation of guidance concepts and proposals. Total group, Dahlstedt and Strack

FIFTH WEEK July 4 - July 8, 1966

STAFF - Phyllis Coker, Byrla Jean, Marion Fowler, Elsie Ross, C.M. Strack, Waldo Dahlstedt

July 4

9 - 12 noon - Psychological backgrounds implications on reading, segregated schools, motivation, oral basis, comprehension

1 - 3 P.M. - How speech affects reading - breaking the language barrier, communications between child and teacher

July 5

9 - 12 noon - Developing functional reading abilities in content fields, technical vocabulary, developing work study skills

1 - 4 P.M. - Materials and aids: multi-ethnic readers, high interest - low reading level materials - low reading ability.

July 6

9 - 10:30 A.M. Remedial reading in integrated classes; diagnosis and treatment.

10:45 - 12 noon Uses of reading approaches

Color code	IFA
SRA	Basal Readers
Programmed	Linguistics
Individualized Reading	Reading machines

1 - 3 P.M. - Seminars - reading program applications

July 7 and 8

Daily - 9 A.M. - 3 P.M. - A final formulation, review, and presentation of the school plans; evaluation of the institute, individual team reporting, team and staff conferences

APPENDIX C

Some Implications of Civil Rights Legislation for our Public Schools

- - - - - - - - - -

A lecture presented at the Civil Rights Act
Title IV Institute
Henderson State Teachers College
By
Floyd W. Parsons
Superintendent of Schools
Little Rock, Arkansas

Since 1787, the United States has been a nation of the type where more people want to come here than want to leave. The in-migration has far exceeded the out-migration. Every generation has received its influx of immigrants. We, who call ourselves white Americans, often tend to forget that our ancestors, too,were immigrants to this new land. Ours is a multicultural society - almost every immigrant group has added some of its skills, some of its customs, some of its folkways, some of its mores to our social patterns. On the other hand, every immigrant group has forfeited some of its skills, some of its customs, some of its folkways, some of its mores in favor of the established patterns of behavior found in America.

Over the years almost every immigrant group has been assimilated into the society - they have often projected themselves into the mainstream of American government, economics, and society. Access to full citizenship has never been an easy task in America! Through slums, through menial jobs, through suspicion, through prejudice, through discrimination, millions have won a place for themselves - have won status in their respective neighborhoods.

Of all barriers faced by minority groups, the most invincible has been the color of the skin. Liberty seemed never to have turned her shining face toward those whose skins were not white. The American Negro, consequently, has been one race that, until recently, has made little progress toward assimilation. Time will not permit a full consideration of the "why" of

this dilemma but dilemma it is, nevertheless. The results of this lack of assimilation are more far-reaching- more frustrating, more damaging. It is with these problems that schools must now wrestle and search for solutions.

Now to some implications of the Civil Rights Law:

1. The American public schools of today are charged with an unprecedented task. Where we were formerly charged with the responsibility of perpetuating an established culture, we now face the task of helping to develop a new culture from the heterogenous cultures found in America.

There are implications for this new responsibility that has devolved upon our public schools. What is the school's role in answering some of the following questions? Do these questions pose problems for education?

(1) What does it do to a Negro child's mind when he sees white pupils going to white schools with white teachers and Negro janitors while Negro children attend Negro schools with Negro teachers and often no janitor at all?

(2) What new role must education play in a society when Negro adults, regardless of status and personal attainment, are called by their first names by all members of the white community?

(3) What does it mean for education if there are no Negro doctors and no Negro lawyers in a community while on the other hand there are no white janitors and no white maids?

(4) What are the implications for education when a school superintendent states that "In my community 70% of the people are Negro and 30% are white." This is a real problem when the minority is in the majority.

(5) What are our responsibilities when public education has, traditionally, taken place in a context. Education has been pitched to the level of the community served. I am not saying this is bad; what I am saying, however, is that it has historically been based upon an upper middle class white society. The textbooks, the material, the training of teachers, all have been skewed toward the white average. In primary readers, the white father with his brief-

case waves goodbye to his attractive wife in her starched dress while the Negro "yard boy" trims the businessman's neatly kept lawn.

2. I am going to shift gears entirely as I identify the second implication of Title IV. It is an implication, nevertheless, and one with which the schools must concern themselves.

The Danger of Federal Control of Education

For the very first time in the history of our great nation, we now have a national superintendent of schools in the Commissioner of Education, and we have a national school board in the Congress of the United States. The failure on the part of cities and communities to adequately cope with the problems of civil rights was, perhaps, the primary and compelling reason why this new education strength developed at the national level. I am not talking about what is right and what is wrong; we are talking about implications of the Civil Rights Act. I have made literally hundreds of speeches in support of federal aid to education over the past quarter of a century. In every talk, I have said that we can have federal aid without federal control. I still think that I was right in concept but practice has not supported my theory.

So that I may not be misunderstood, let me explain that school districts and states are largely responsible for this. We, in far too many cases, did not comply with the law and thus abdicated our authority to a higher level.

3. The third implication that I would identify is the new need, on the part of school administrators, to reassess the whole structure and purposes of public education. Historically, we have administered neighborhood schools. The children of the affluent parents whose homes were concentrated in the Nob Hill and Richland Heights areas of our cities attended school together. Then there was the middle class section somewhere nearer the central downtown area of the city. Then, finally, we had schools that served the children from Dark Hollow and Poverty Flats. Our programs have largely been geared to

challenge the best at each level and permit the lowest achiever at each level to experience some measure of success.

I do not know what the new pattern of organization will be but I do know one thing - <u>There will be a new pattern of organization</u>.

What are some of the deficiencies of the disadvantaged that must be overcome with the help of the schools? Perhaps an identification of the needs that must be met would give us a sense of direction in program planning.

Research indicates that the disadvantaged child - not inherently - but because of his place in a society dominated by the upper middle class has the following tendencies:

(1) A language difficulty.

(2) Slower perceptual development.

(3) A more restricted awareness of the perceptual discriminations possible among many sensory dimensions.

(4) Quantitative concepts are limited.

(5) Disadvantaged children are more concrete-minded - they are oriented toward things and objects rather than toward abstractions and conceptual manipulation.

(6) They have shorter attention spans, memory, and anticipation spans. This means they function in terms of immediate goals rather than long-range goals.

What I am saying is that a disadvantaged child will eat his favorite piece of candy first while an upper middle class child will "save the best for last." The middle class child feels that he has come control over the future; the deprived child feels that the future cannot be controlled by present action.

(7) Lower class children are most passive. They usually have no evidence nor experience that teaches them that the environment can be manipulated, controlled, or changed by anything they might do.

(8) Specifically, Negroes generally tend toward low self-acceptance. Even when every evidence is to the contrary, Negro students often judge themselves inferior to white students.

This knowledge that has been accumulated concerning the disadvantaged,

coupled with the civil rights legislation, poses new and more challenging problems for the schools.

4. Although the fourth implication is closely associated with the third, I have chosen to treat it separately. A new artificiality is implied in civil rights legislation.

Traditionally, school doors have swung open on September 1st each year, the pupils have enrolled, the teachers begin to work - this was the normal procedure. Under civil rights legislation, we are more or less charged with the responsibility of creating a student body through the process of artificial insemination. We look at the number of white pupils in a school - we look at the number of Negro pupils in a school. It may look pretty reasonable to us but suddenly visions of federal dollars with wings begin to dance before our eyes. Then we begin in all seriousness to ask ourselves a question. "I wonder how the racial composition of this school will look to the U.S. Office?" We are privileged to answer this question for ourselves first. If our answer to ourselves is "not so hot," we initiate a search, on a purely artificial basis, for a more equitable racial mixture in this school.

What I am saying is that the comfort of segregated schools in the South, the days of "letting the chips fall where they may," are over. We must now organize, plan, structure, and implement as never before. We should have been doing it a long time ago, but we, in far too many cases, waited for the heavy hand of Uncle Sam.

5. And now the fifth implication. A new race prejudice has been created by civil rights legislation. Prejudice is an evil and destructive force from whatever direction it comes. There has been, and doubtless still is, white prejudice against the Negro. If indeed the Negroes were prejudiced against the white race, the prejudice was not in evidence. Recent

activities, however, among the Negro race indicate the development of new and deep-seated prejudices against the white race. These prejudices have been fanned into flame on numerous occasions by the Black Muslims, the "intellectuals," the "sitters," "kneelers,", "marchers," and the"placard-bearers." We began with the basic thesis that prejudice of any kind is an evil and destructive force. The gains may outweigh the consequences, but I fear that white prejudice against the Negro is not being reduced at a rate that will fully compensate for the growing rate of Negro prejudice against the white.

6. The sixth implication of civil rights legislation has to do with the Negro teacher. The only places in the nation where the number of Negro teachers is proportional to the number of Negro students are those areas where segregated schools have been maintained. The implication is simply this - <u>The special protection the Negro teachers have gained from the "dual market" has been, or will be, lost</u>.

The segregated schools of the South have,historically, produced a "dual market" which provided a special job protection for Negro teachers. As progress is made in the concept of faculty integration, whites and Negroes will be competing for the same positions. Not in every instance but on the average Negroes will lose. There is no prejudice whatsoever in this statement. The separate but equal concept was declared invalid, inoperable, and unsound in 1954. The change since that time, according to the U. S. Office of Education, has been negligible.

A vast majority of our Negro teachers in the South are graduates of separate and "unequal" public schools, separate and "unequal" colleges, and have been denied the academic, cultural, and social benefits available to the whites. If these experiences have meaning for people, and I believe they do, then the average Negro teacher is not as well prepared to teach children as the average white teacher.

If all-Negro schools can produce students of equal quality, if schools without adequate materials, supplies, aids, and buildings can produce superior students; if poorly-trained teachers can do an outstanding job of teaching; if going to the public library and belonging to the civic music association are meaningless experiences, then the question of integration of faculty is purely a sociological problem and totally unrelated to education.

7. Finally, and with this implication, I sound a more optimistic note. We are going to learn through this legislation that we can do a multiplicity of things that we did not think we could do. This experience is going to give us a new courage, a forward thrust, and an optimism that is almost blind to the "dangers" in every community. This job will be done and over with one of these days. We will tend to say to ourselves, "If we come through this one, I am not afraid to tackle any problem related to our public schools."

We will learn that student bodies can be integrated; that sports programs can be organized and conducted without regard to race; that Negroes and whites can work together in Parent-Teacher Associations; that faculties can be employed and organized on a basis of racial mixture.

Five years ago, I never would have believed that all of these would happen in Little Rock by 1965. They have! This convinces me that the job can be done and with an ease and a grace that will often surprise one. We have white teachers teaching all Negro classes; we have Negro teachers teaching all white classes; and we have both white and Negro teachers teaching integrated classes.

The progress that has been made should give us courage, a forward thrust, and a new optimism. These, in my judgement, are some of the critical implications of recent civil rights legislation.

APPENDIX D

OPINION SURVEY
FORM A

1. Do you think you would ever find it distasteful

   a. To eat at the same table with a Caucasian? Yes___No___Don't know___
   b. To dance with a Caucasian? Yes___No___Don't know___
   c. To have a Caucasian attend your church? Yes___No___Don't know___
   d. To go to a party and fine that most of the people are Caucasian? Yes___No___Don't know___
   e. To have a Caucasian marry one of your close relatives? Yes___No___Don't know___
   f. To hear of famous and well-to-do Negroes marrying Caucasians? Yes___No___Don't know___

2. As you see it, do you think that most Caucasians think that Negroes are demanding more than they have a right to? Yes___NO___Don't know___

3. Do you feel that most Caucasians who participate in Civil Rights drives are really concerned about the Negroe's plight? Yes___No___Don't know___

4. Do you feel that Caucasians fon"t want Negroes to obtain their rights as rapidly as they seek to do so? Yes___No___Don't know___

5. Imagine you are a member of a newly desegregated faculty. In the cafeteria four white teachers who have been served fail to sit with the lone Negro teacher seated at one of the faculty tables.

   a. Would you sit with the Negroe teacher? Yes___No___Don't know___
   b. Would you invite the teacher to join you and the other teachers? Yes___No___Don't know___
   c. Would you sit alone at another table? Yes___No___Don't know___
   d. Would you sit at the table with the white teachers? Yes___No___Don't know___

   e. If the Negro teacher got up and left the cafeteria before finishing would you Approve____Disapprove____

f. What do you think the teacher should do

(1) Avoid these teachers_____
(2) Report the incident to the principal_____
(3) Ask for a transfer_____
(4) Ignore the situation_____

6. Do you feel

a. That Negroes are trying to obtain their rights too fast? Yes___No___Don't know___

b. That the large number of demonstrations has impeded the Negro rights movement? Yes___No___Don't know___

c. That your superintendent and adminsitrative personnel accept Negroes? Yes___No___Don't know___

7. How do you feel that the following organizations and individuals have affected the Negro drive for Civil Rights?

	very helpful	somewhat helpful	somewhat harmful	very harmful
a. John Birch Society	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Minutemen	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Ku Klux Klan	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. White Citizens Council	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Republican Party	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Democratic Party	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. George Wallace	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. The Black Muslims	_____	_____	_____	_____

OPINION SURVEY
FORM β

1. Do you think you would ever fine it distasteful

   a. To eat at the same table with a Negro?

   Yes____No____Don't know_____

   b. To dance with a Negro? Yes____No____Don't know_____

   c. To go to a party and find that most of the people are Negro?

   Yes____No____Don't know_____

   d. To have a Negro marry someone in your family?

   Yes____No____Don't know_____

2. As you see it do you think that Negroes today are demanding more than they have a right to?

   Yes____No____Don't know_____

3. Do you think that Negroes are trying to push in where that are not wanted?

   Yes____No____Don't know_____

4. Imagine you are in a retuarant. Ayoung well dressed Negro man comes in and sits down to have a dinner and is refused service.

   a. Would you approve or disapprove of his not being served?

   Approve____Disapprove_____

   b. What do you think the Negro should do

   Leave without saying anything___
   Protest to the manager____
   Try to sue the manager____

   c. Now suppose that instead of leaving, the Negro customer complains to the manager and the manager says:
   "Look, fellow, I like your kind of people and I'd be glad to serve you, but my customers object. Be a good sport and try someplace else, will you?" Would you

   Approve_____Disapprove_____

   d. Now suppose a well known doctor who overhears the conversation between the manager and the Negro says: "I think you should serve this gentleman. He's entitled to service just like the rest of us. I think you are wrong about how your customers feel. This is America you know, and we want to see all people get fairly treated. If you don't serve him you will lose my trade for good." Would you

   Approve____Disapprove_____

e. Suppose the Negro who has refused service decided to take it to court to sue the Manager. Would you

Approve____Disapprove_____

f. And what do you think most of the peole in your hometown would do

Approve____Disapprove_____

5. Would you approve or disapprove of the following in your hometown

	Approve	Disapprove
a. Negroes being served in white restaurants	_____	_____
b. Negroes being hired as dept. store sales clerks	_____	_____
c. Negroes using white barber shops and beauty parlors	_____	_____
d. Negroes staying at white hotels and motels	_____	_____
e. Negroes joining Social clubs (Rotary Country Clubs)	_____	_____
f. Negroes trying on clothes in your regular ready-to-wear clothing store	_____	_____
g. Negroes joining your church	_____	_____

6. How do you feel the following individuals or organizations have furthered the over-all cause of the Negro in America

	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Somewhat harmful	Very harmful
a. NAACP	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. CORE	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Martin Luther King	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. The Selma march	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. The Supreme Court	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. White "Civil Rights" workers	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. The Protestant Church	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. The Catholic Church	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. The Black Muslims	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. On the whole would you say that you like or dislike Negroes

Like____Dislike____

Are your feelings

Pretty strong____Not so strong____Not strong at all____

Would you say that you are more or less prejudiced than most of your friends

More prejudiced____Less____ About the same____

50

F-SCALE: FORMS 45 AND 40 (REVISED)

The following statements refer to opinions regarding a number of social groups and issues, about which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each statement in the left-hand margin according to your agreement or disagreement, as follows:

+1:	Slight support, agreement	-1:	slight opposition, disagreement
+2:	moderate support, "	-2:	moderate opposition, "
+3:	strong support, "	-3:	strong opposition, "

_____1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

_____2. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

_____3. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

_____4. The business man and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and professor.

_____5. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

_____6. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

_____7. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

_____8. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom people can put their faith.

_____9. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

_____10. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

_____11. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination and the will to work and fight for family and country.

_____12. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

_____13. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

_____14. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

51

_____15. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people.

_____16. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

_____17. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

_____18. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.

_____19. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

_____20. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

_____21. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

_____22. Wars and social trouble may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the world.

_____23. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

_____24. Most people con't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

_____25. Human nature being what it is, there will be always war and conflict.

_____26. Familiarity breeds contempt.

_____27. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or desease from them.

_____28. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

_____29. The true American way of life is disappearing so fast that force may be necessary to preserve it.

_____30. The trouble with letting everybody have a say in running the government is that so many people are just naturally stupid or full of wild ideas.

INVENTORY OF BELIEFS

PARTICIPANT SCORES

Female	Male
103	95
97	93
93	92
91	91
87	88
83	84
80	83
78	81
77	81
76	77
76	75
74	74
70	70
70	70
64	60
64	59
53	56
43	50
39	49
32	46
21 number of women	22 number of men
67 median score	64 median score

Scores below 50 are indications of stereotyped and rigid preferences.

53

HUMAN RELATIONS INVENTORY

1. Indicate your feelings of adequacy, inadequacy, or doubt about the following items:

	Adequate	Inadequate	Doubtful
a. Knowledge about the local school community	_____	_____	_____
b. Skill in dealing with disinterested parents	_____	_____	_____
c. Knowing how to handle defiant children	_____	_____	_____
d. Understanding of the nature of prejudice	_____	_____	_____
e. Definition of human relations and insight into teacherr's role in the program	_____	_____	_____
f. Ways to identify human relations needs in the classroom and school	_____	_____	_____
g. Techniques to eradicate prejudice in the classroom	_____	_____	_____
h. Methods of enriching subject matter areas with inter-cultural experiences	_____	_____	_____
i. Capacity to explore own feelings about group differences	_____	_____	_____
j. Overcoming motivation lags of pupils	_____	_____	_____
k. Understanding of minority racial, religious, ethnic groups and contributions to society	_____	_____	_____
l. Capacity to contribute to development of pupils' social skills in extra-curricular and out-of-school activities	_____	_____	_____

2. Looking back on your previous teaching experiences, in which operations were you most successful? (Check two)

a. Looking objectively at my classroom procedures ___

b. Accepting all children equally ___

c. Providing opportunities for each child to reach self-fulfillment ___

d. Allowing pupils time to plan and develop ideas ___

e. Giving each child a feeling he was a necessary part of class ___

f. Completing the course of study for the semester or year ___

g. Maintaining a happy and friendly classroom ___

h. Developing a group spirit ___

i. Providing opporunity for each child to feel a measure of success ___

j. Encouraged pupils to talk more freely with me about themselves and peer relationships ___

k. Grouping for individual differences ___

l. Communicating an honst respect for each child ___

3. Which would be the least desirable kind of pupils in your class? (Check two)

Those who

a. refuse to learn ___

b. are boisterous show-offs ___

c. are poorly groomed ___

d. come from minority ethnic groups ___

e. come from broken homes ___

f. have low intelligence ___

g. come from transient families ___

h. come from families on public assistance ___

i. are repeating a grade ___

j. are hostile and belligerent ___

4. Indicate the parental groups that you would feel most confident in working with to solve pupil problems: (Check two)

a. High socio-economic status ____
b. Minority religious group ____
c. Critical of school's program ____
d. Solid middle-class citizen ____
e. Lower cultural status ____
f. Campaigning for open enrollment ____
g. Holders of a college degree ____
h. Uneducated, but hard working, clean parent ____

5. Which category best describes your regular, other than in work, contact with the following groups?

	Little or none	occasionally	frequently	regularly
a. Other religious groups	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Other ethnic groups	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Other racial groups	_____	_____	_____	_____

6. Which of the following categories of problems would you be most interested in attempting to solve within your classroom? (Check two)

a. Social immaturity ____
b. Religious ____
c. Socio-economic ____
d. Intellectual diffenences ____
e. Racial ____
f. Nationality ____
g. Emotional maladjustment ____
h. Personal grooming ____

WHAT MAKES A GOOD TEAM?

The variables or "requirements" are defined in terms of ideal conditions as they apply to each member.

1. Mutual Trust

   I can state my views and differences openly without fear of ridicule or retaliation and permit others to do the same. No one on the team will "cut the other's throat."

2. Mutual Support

   I can get help from others on the team and give help to them without being concerned about prerogatives. I don't have to protect my function against them nor do they need to protect theirs against me.

3. Communications

   I don't have to be guarded and cautious about my communication. Because of mutual trust and support, I can say what I feel and how I am reacting.

4. Team Objectives

   No objective will be assumed by the team until it is clearly understood by all members.

   No objective will be assumed by the team until we've worked our way through our differences and can honestly say we're committed to achieving the objective.

5. Conflict Resolution

   We accept conflicts as necessary and desirable. We don't suppress them nor pretend they don't exist; we work them through, openly, as a team.

6. Utilization of Member Resources

   My individual abilities, knowledge and experience are fully utilized by the team and I use those of other members. We accept and give advice, counsel, and support to each other while recognizing individual accountability and specialization.

7. Control Methods

   I accept the responsibility for keeping discussions relevant and for the integrity of the team operation; each other member accepts the same responsibility. We don't need a chairman or other devices to control us.

8. Organizational Environment

   We respect individual differences. We don't push each other to conform to central ideas or ways of thinking. We work hard at keeping our "team climate" free, open and supportive of each other.

ANALYZING TEAM EFFECTIVENESS

Analyze your team (the faculty with whom you work) by rating it on a scale from 1 to 7 (7 being what you would consider to be ideal) with respect to each of these variables:

1. Degree of Mutual Trust

   High Suspicion (1)_____(7) High Trust

2. Degree of Mutual Support

   Every Man for Himself (1)_____(7) Genuine Concern for Each Other

3. Communications

   Guarded, Cautious (1)_____(7) Open, Authentic

   We Don't Listen to Each Other (1)_____(7) We Understand & Are Understood; We Listen

4. Team Objectives

   Not Understood by Team (1)_____(7) Clearly Understood by Team

   Team is Negative Toward Objectives (1)_____(7) Team is Committed To Objectives

5. Handling Conflicts Within Team

   We Deny, Avoid or Suppress Conflicts (1)_____(7) We Accept Conflicts and "Work Them Through"

6. Utilization of Member Resources

   Our Abilities, Knowledge, & Experience Aren't Utilized by the Team (1)_____(7) Our Abilities, Knowledge, & Experience Are Fully Utilized by the Team

7. Control Methods

   Control is Imposed on Us (1)_____(7) We Control Ourselves

8. Organizational Environment

   Restrictive; Pressure Toward Conformity (1)_____(7) Free, Supportive; Respect for Individual Differences

APPENDIX E

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
Desegregation Institute
June 6 - July 8, 1966

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

As a basis for developing an overall evaluation of the institute and the technical report, we should appreciate having you respond to the topics below. Please give us your appraisal and reactions to the following aspects of the workshops:

1. Scope of the content of the institute program:

2. General interest in the program

3. Usefulness of institute for application to curriculum and teaching

4. Facilities of the workshop

5. Staff of the workshop.

6. Guest speakers of the workshop, who was most effective for you?

7. Reading materials for institute.

8. Plans required for institute credit.

9. Which resource person would most aid a follow-up day?

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
Desegregation Institute Evaluation
(June 6 - July 8, 1966)

Rate the institute in the following aspects:
Circle the numeral rating you wish to make on each line.

1. Effective aid to you in dealing with faculty desegregation?

Excellent Good Fair Poor

8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

2. How much has your attitude toward those of the opposite race changed?

Greatly Some Slightly to None

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

3. The nature of the change was?

Greater acceptance Increased separation

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

4. Assess the staff contribution?

a. Resource Group

Very helpful Some Poor

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

b. Directors

Very helpful Some Poor

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

c. Special Instructors (check appropriate levels)

Very helpful Some Poor

Background

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Methods

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Language Arts

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Guidance

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

61